UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,183	12/31/2003	David P. Marmaros	16113-1317001 / GP-178-00	5002

26192   7590   06/12/2009
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/12/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
 Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *4/1/2009*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1 and 61-92* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1 and 61-92* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant has amended claims 1 and canceled claims 2-60 and added claims 61-

92 in the amendment filed on 4/1/2009.

Claims 1, 61-92 are pending in this office action.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 61-92 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argued that Cupps and Schneider do not teach " generating in the

search engine two or more search results in response to the search query, each of the

search results including: a corresponding search result document link to a top of a

corresponding search result document; and a corresponding active snippet link to a

portion of the corresponding search result document, the active snippet link containing a

query-relevant snippet, the query-relevant snippet being text extracted from the

corresponding search result document by the search engine; generating in the search

engine an instruction for each of the two or more search results that is configured to:

cause the client device to display the query-relevant snippet of the corresponding

search result on the client device; and navigate directly to within the portion of the

corresponding search result document when the corresponding active snippet link is

selected by a user from display of the query-relevant snippet of the corresponding

search result on the client device".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As to claim 1, Schneider teaches the claimed limitations:

"generating in the search engine two or more search results in response to the search query" as displaying two or more search results in response to the search query including query term (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67);

"a corresponding active snippet link to a portion of the corresponding search result document, the active snippet link containing including a query-relevant snippet, the query-relevant snippet being text extracted from the corresponding search result document by the search engine" as (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60);

"cause the client device to display the query-relevant snippets of the search result on the client device" as displaying the search results including the query-relevant snippets (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60);

"providing from the search engine the instructions for the two or more search results to the client device in response to the search query" as providing from the search engine the instructions such as search within this sites for search results (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60).

Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations "generating in the search engine an instruction for each of the two or more search results that is configured to cause the client device" "navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document when the corresponding active snippet link is

selected by a user from the display of the query-relevant snippet of the corresponding

search result on the client device";

Cupps teaches FIGS. 8-10 are exemplary menu web pages 144. FIG. 8 is a

menu web page 144 showing the first five pizza restaurants that deliver within a

particular customer's location. The restaurants shown are selected based on the

customer's location and the restaurant's delivery area. As such, this menu web page

144 is dynamically created for this particular customer. Likewise, FIG. 9 is a menu web

page 144 showing the various types of food items that a particular restaurant offers for

delivery service within a particular customer's location. This menu web page 144 was

created in response to the customer's request for pizza selections. FIG. 10 is a menu

web page 144 showing the various types of "pesce fresco" items that a particular

restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customers location. This menu

web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for "pesce fresco"

selections (col. 9, lines 15-35). The above information shows that as Enzo's is

extracted from web page of fig. 8 to display to a user in another web page of fig. 9 by a

search engine after a user selection.

The customer can then select a particular vendor or restaurant and one or more

menu web pages 144 including the selected information that is dynamically created by

the web creation procedure 126 and provided to the customer's client computer 102.

The customer can then browse through the menu web pages 144 and select items of

interest. The user's selection or requests are used by the web creation procedure 126

to generate one or more menu web pages 144 that are displayed to the customer (step

306). FIGS. 8-10 illustrate such exemplary menu web pages 144. The customer

places an order by selecting the appropriate items from the menu web pages 144 (step

308) which are then transmitted to the online ordering machine 106 (step 310). The

online ordering machine 106 receives the order and processes it as shown in FIG. 13

(step 310) (col. 10, lines 7-3). The above information shows that the creation

procedure 126 is created for search results to allow a user to navigate directly a portion

of the 'pesce fresco' within the webpage when the user selects the 'pesce fresco'. The

creation procedure 126 is represented as an instruction for search results. Pesce

fresco is represented as the query-relevant snippet that is selected by a user from a

display of the corresponding search results on the customer device.

As discussed above the combination teaches all of claimed limitations as

discussed above.

Remark: the term "a computer readable storage medium" in claims 82-92 are

defined as hardware device only such as ROM 126 or memory 124 according to fig. 10

of the specification.

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 1, 61, 71, 72, 82, 83 are objected to because of the following

informalities: The term "the corresponding search result" in claims 1, 61, 71-72, 82-83

should be written as "the corresponding search result document" since it refers to the

term "a corresponding search result document in claim 1, lines 6-7, claim 71, lines 3-4,

claim 82, lines 8-9. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1, 61, 63, 70-72, 74, 81-83, 85, 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Schneider (US 6895430) in view of Cupps et al (or hereinafter

"Cupps") (US 5991739) and Law in the Outer Limit?, Therese O'Donnell, or (hereinafter

"O'Donnell") 19997.

As to claim 1, Schneider teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving in a search engine a search query from a client device" as sending a

search query to a search server from client, the server returns search results responsive

to the search query to search client (figs. 1d, 5b-6b, col. 12, lines 5-15; col. 17, lines 35-

67), "the search query including one or more query terms" as the query including as

query term (fig. 5b, col. 17, lines 55-67; col. 18, lines 1-25);

"generating in the search engine two or more search results in response to the

search query" as displaying two or more search results in response to the search query

including query term (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67);

"each of the search results including a corresponding search result document link to a top of a corresponding search result document" as shown in fig. 6b, each search result including a link such as www.com to a corresponding document but this link is not to a top of a corresponding search result document (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67);

"a corresponding active snippet link to a portion of the corresponding search result document, the active snippet link containing a query-relevant snippet, the query-relevant snippet being text extracted from the corresponding search result document by the search engine" as (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60);

"cause the client device to display the query-relevant snippets of the corresponding search result document on the client device" as displaying the search results including the query-relevant snippets (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60);

"providing from the search engine the instructions for the two or more search results to the client device in response to the search query" as providing from the search engine the instructions such as search within this sites for search results (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60).

Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations "to a top of a corresponding search result document; generating in the search engine an instruction for each of the two or more search results that is configured to cause the client device" "navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document when the corresponding active snippet link is selected by a user from the display of the query-relevant snippet of the corresponding search result on the client device";

Cupps teaches FIGS. 8-10 are exemplary menu web pages 144. FIG. 8 is a

menu web page 144 showing the first five pizza restaurants that deliver within a

particular customer's location. The restaurants shown are selected based on the

customer's location and the restaurant's delivery area. As such, this menu web page

144 is dynamically created for this particular customer. Likewise, FIG. 9 is a menu web

page 144 showing the various types of food items that a particular restaurant offers for

delivery service within a particular customer's location. This menu web page 144 was

created in response to the customer's request for pizza selections. FIG. 10 is a menu

web page 144 showing the various types of "pesce fresco" items that a particular

restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customers location. This menu

web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for "pesce fresco"

selections (col. 9, lines 15-35). The above information shows that as Enzo's is

extracted from web page of fig. 8 to display to a user in another web page of fig. 9 by a

search engine after a user selection.

The customer can then select a particular vendor or restaurant and one or more

menu web pages 144 including the selected information that is dynamically created by

the web creation procedure 126 and provided to the customer's client computer 102.

The customer can then browse through the menu web pages 144 and select items of

interest. The user's selection or requests are used by the web creation procedure 126

to generate one or more menu web pages 144 that are displayed to the customer (step

306). FIGS. 8-10 illustrate such exemplary menu web pages 144. The customer

places an order by selecting the appropriate items from the menu web pages 144 (step

308) which are then transmitted to the online ordering machine 106 (step 310). The

online ordering machine 106 receives the order and processes it as shown in FIG. 13

(step 310) (col. 10, lines 7-3). The above information shows that the creation

procedure 126 is created for search results to allow a user to navigate directly a portion

of the 'pesce fresco' within the webpage when the user selects the 'pesce fresco'. The

creation procedure 126 is represented as an instruction for search results. Pesce

fresco is represented as the query-relevant snippet that is selected by a user from a

display of the corresponding search results on the customer device.

Donnell teaches navigating directly a portion within a document and a document

includes link to a top of the search result document (pages 1-3).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Cupp's teaching of using the creation procedure 126

to navigate a portion of search result based on user's selection and Donnell's teaching

of navigating directly a portion within a document and a document includes link to a top

of the search result document to Schneider's system in order to allow a client to

narrow down search result or view each portion of a document following his or her

desire so that searching a search result is performed quickly.

As to claims 61, 72 and 83, Schneider, Cupps and O'Donnell, teach the claimed

limitation "the corresponding active snippet link includes an artificial anchor referencing

the portion of the corresponding search result containing the query-relevant snippet" as

(Schneider, col. 19, lines 45-67; fig. 6b), and "the corresponding search result document

link does not include an artificial anchor referencing any particular portion of the

corresponding search result document" as (O'Donnell, Bibliography link does not

contains any link to a portion of the document, pages 1-2).

As to claims 63, 74 and 85, Schneider, Cupps and O'Donnell disclose the

claimed limitation subject matter in claims 1, 71 and 82, O'Donnell further teaches the

claimed limitation "the query-relevant snippet further comprises one or more of the

query terms; and the instruction is configured to cause the client device to navigate

directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document when the one or

more query terms are selected by the user from the display of the query-relevant

snippet" as the query relevant snippet includes query terms to allow a user navigate

directly to the portions of a document when the one or more terms such as 'The

Judgment; Analysis; Headlines as Literary Works' (page 1-2).

As to claims 70, 81 and 92, Schneider, Cupps and O'Donnell disclose the

claimed limitation subject matter in claims 1, 71 and 82, Cupps further teach the claimed

limitation "each of the search results generated by the search engine comprises a

plurality of query relevant snippets extracted from the corresponding search result

document by the search engine, each of the plurality of query-relevant snippets being

associated with a corresponding active snippet link; and the instruction for each of the

two or more search results is configured to cause the client device to display each of the

plurality of query-relevant snippets on the client device and to navigate directly to a

portion of a respective one of the plurality of query-relevant snippets within the

corresponding search result document when the respective active snippet link is

selected by a user from a display of the corresponding search result on the client

device" as FIGS. 8-10 are exemplary menu web pages 144. FIG. 8 is a menu web page

144 showing the first five pizza restaurants that deliver within a particular customer's

location. The restaurants shown are selected based on the customer's location and the

restaurant's delivery area. As such, this menu web page 144 is dynamically created for

this particular customer. Likewise, FIG. 9 is a menu web page 144 showing the various

types of food items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery service within a

particular customer's location. This menu web page 144 was created in response to the

customer's request for pizza selections. FIG. 10 is a menu web page 144 showing the

various types of "pesce fresco" items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery

service within a particular customers location. This menu web page 144 was created in

response to the customer's request for "pesce fresco" selections (col. 9, lines 15-35).

The customer can then select a particular vendor or restaurant and one or more

menu web pages 144 including the selected information that is dynamically created by

the web creation procedure 126 and provided to the customer's client computer 102.

The customer can then browse through the menu web pages 144 and select items of

interest. The user's selection or requests are used by the web creation procedure 126

to generate one or more menu web pages 144 that are displayed to the customer (step

306). FIGS. 8-10 illustrate such exemplary menu web pages 144. The customer

places an order by selecting the appropriate items from the menu web pages 144 (step

308) which are then transmitted to the online ordering machine 106 (step 310). The

online ordering machine 106 receives the order and processes it as shown in FIG. 13

(step 310) (col. 10, lines 7-3).

As to claim 71, Schneider teaches the same claimed limitation as discussed in

claim 1, Schneider further teaches the claimed limitations:

"one or more computers" as a computer 102 (fig. 2, col. 4, lines 1-5);

"a computer-readable medium coupled to the one or more computers having

instructions stored thereon which, when executed by the one or more computers, cause

the one or more computers to perform operations comprising" as a computer-readable

medium coupled to the one or more computers having instructions stored thereon

which, when executed by the one or more computers, cause the one or more computers

to perform operations (col. 4, lines 1-20).

As to claim 82, Schneider teaches the same claimed limitation as discussed in

claim 1, Schneider further teaches the claimed limitations "a computer storage medium

encoded with a computer program, the program comprising instructions that when

executed by data processing apparatus cause the data processing apparatus to perform

operations comprising" (col. 4, lines 1-20).

6. Claims 62, 64, 73, 75, 84 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Schneider (US 6895430) in view of Cupps and O'Donnell and further

in view of Hennings et al (or hereinafter "Hennings") (US 6763496).

As to claims 62 and 73, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation

"wherein at least one of the search results further comprises a second corresponding

active snippet link to a separate portion of the corresponding search result document

containing a second query-relevant snippet.

Hennings teaches homepage 100 is at the top level of the content hierarchy, and

there is a nested page for each of the travel categories that can be reached by either

clicking one of the picture icons or one of the associated text hyperlink anchors. For

instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to

Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises page to open in the browser. The Cruises page,

and the pages associated with the other travel categories (e.g., Air Travel page, Trains

page, etc., are all nested at a second level of the content hierarchy. As with the

homepage 100, Cruises page 118 also contains hyperlinks pointing to pages that are

nested below it, including Alaska hyperlink 120,Caribbean hyperlink 122, Puerto Rico

hyperlink 124, and Mexico hyperlink 126. Each of these hyperlinks can be used to

locate a page at a third level of the content hierarchy (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 47-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Hennings's teaching of homepage 100 is at the top

level of the content hierarchy, and there is a nested page for each of the travel

categories that can be reached by either clicking one of the picture icons or one of the

associated text hyperlink anchors. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text

hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises

page to open in the browser. The Cruises page, and the pages associated with the

other travel categories (e.g., Air Travel page, Trains page, etc., are all nested at a

second level of the content hierarchy. As with the homepage 100, Cruises page 118

also contains hyperlinks pointing to pages that are nested below it, including Alaska

hyperlink 120,Caribbean hyperlink 122, Puerto Rico hyperlink 124, and Mexico

hyperlink 126. Each of these hyperlinks can be used to locate a page at a third level of

the content hierarchy to Schneider's system in order to system in order to allow a client

to narrow down search result following his or her desire so that searching a search

result is performed quickly.

As to claim 84, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein

at least one of the search results further comprises a second corresponding active

snippet link to a separate portion of the corresponding search result document

containing the query-relevant snippet".

Hennings teaches homepage 100 is at the top level of the content hierarchy, and

there is a nested page for each of the travel categories that can be reached by either

clicking one of the picture icons or one of the associated text hyperlink anchors. For

instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to

Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises page to open in the browser. The Cruises page,

and the pages associated with the other travel categories (e.g., Air Travel page, Trains page, etc., are all nested at a second level of the content hierarchy. As with the homepage 100, Cruises page 118 also contains hyperlinks pointing to pages that are nested below it, including Alaska hyperlink 120,Caribbean hyperlink 122, Puerto Rico hyperlink 124, and Mexico hyperlink 126. Each of these hyperlinks can be used to locate a page at a third level of the content hierarchy (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 47-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hennings's teaching of homepage 100 is at the top level of the content hierarchy, and there is a nested page for each of the travel categories that can be reached by either clicking one of the picture icons or one of the associated text hyperlink anchors. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises page to open in the browser. The Cruises page, and the pages associated with the other travel categories (e.g., Air Travel page, Trains page, etc., are all nested at a second level of the content hierarchy. As with the homepage 100, Cruises page 118 also contains hyperlinks pointing to pages that are nested below it, including Alaska hyperlink 120,Caribbean hyperlink 122, Puerto Rico hyperlink 124, and Mexico hyperlink 126. Each of these hyperlinks can be used to locate a page at a third level of the content hierarchy to Schneider's system in order to system in order to allow a client to narrow down search result following his or her desire so that searching a search result is performed quickly.

As to claims 64, 75 and 86, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each instruction includes an intra-document link for the query-relevant snippet, each intra-document link pointing to the portion of the query-relevant snippet within the corresponding search result document".

Hennings teaches homepage 100 is at the top level of the content hierarchy, and there is a nested page for each of the travel categories that can be reached by either clicking one of the picture icons or one of the associated text hyperlink anchors. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises page to open in the browser. The Cruises page, and the pages associated with the other travel categories (e.g., Air Travel page, Trains page, etc., are all nested at a second level of the content hierarchy. As with the homepage 100, Cruises page 118 also contains hyperlinks pointing to pages that are nested below it, including Alaska hyperlink 120,Caribbean hyperlink 122, Puerto Rico hyperlink 124, and Mexico hyperlink 126. Each of these hyperlinks can be used to locate a page at a third level of the content hierarchy (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 47-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hennings's teaching of homepage 100 is at the top level of the content hierarchy, and there is a nested page for each of the travel categories that can be reached by either clicking one of the picture icons or one of the associated text hyperlink anchors. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises page to open in the browser. The Cruises page, and the pages associated with the

other travel categories (e.g., Air Travel page, Trains page, etc., are all nested at a

second level of the content hierarchy. As with the homepage 100, Cruises page 118

also contains hyperlinks pointing to pages that are nested below it, including Alaska

hyperlink 120,Caribbean hyperlink 122, Puerto Rico hyperlink 124, and Mexico

hyperlink 126. Each of these hyperlinks can be used to locate a page at a third level of

the content hierarchy to Schneider's system in order to system in order to allow a client

to narrow down search result following his or her desire so that searching a search

result is performed quickly.

7.   Claims 65-67, 76-78, 87-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Schneider (US 6895430) in view of Cupps et al (or hereinafter

"Cupps") (US 5991739) and Law in the Outer Limit?, Therese O'Donnell, or (hereinafter

"O'Donnell") 19997 and further in view of Hennings et al (or hereinafter "Hennings")

(US 6763496) and Caronni et al (or hereinafter "Caronni") (US 2003/0154221).

        As to claims 65, 76 and 87, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed

limitation "wherein each intra-document link contains an artificial anchor undefined in

the corresponding search result document".

        Caronni teaches when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to

the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file

system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first

uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may

subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link

S:\eng\user123\file 1 .txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup

routine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching (fig. 4,

paragraph [0030, 0037]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of when lookup routine determines

that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view

table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the

entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the

lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon

string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1 .txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus,

the lookup routine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for

searching to Schneider's system in order to allow processes to enforce different views

dependent on the context that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to

the expanded sequence.

As to claims 66, 77 and 88, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed

limitation "wherein each artificial anchor includes a preassigned artificial anchor

designator designating the anchor as artificial".

Caronni teaches when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to

the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file

system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first

uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1 .txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup rountine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching. S:\eng\ is represented as artificial anchor designator (fig. 4, paragraph [0030, 0037]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1 .txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup rountine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching to Schneider's system in order to allow processes to enforce different views dependent on the context that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

As to claims 67, 78 and 89, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each artificial anchor includes the preassigned artificial anchor designator as one of a prefix and a suffix and wherein the preassigned artificial anchor designator includes a preassigned set of text characters".

Caronni teaches S:\eng\ as prefix. This prefix includes a set of character such

as user123\file1 .txt or user342\file1 .txt. The S:\eng\ as anchor designator (fig. 4).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of \eng\ as prefix. This prefix

includes a set of character such as user123\file1 .txt or user342\file1 .txt to Schneider's

system in order to allow processes to enforce different views dependent on the context

that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

8.   Claims 68, 79 and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Schneider (US 6895430) in view of Cupps et al (or hereinafter

"Cupps") (US 5991739) and Law in the Outer Limit?, Therese O'Donnell, or (hereinafter

"O'Donnell") 19997 and further in view of Hennings et al (or hereinafter "Hennings") (US

6763496) and Hill et al (or hereinafter "Hill") (US 2004/0024788).

As to claims 68, 79 and 90, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed

limitation "determining whether each corresponding search result document link

references an anchor defined in each corresponding search result document; and

stripping the reference to the anchor from the corresponding search result document

link if the corresponding search result document link references the anchor".

Hill teaches Plant-Models list page 20 contains a link back to parent Model page

24. It means that when a user want to back to parent Model page 24, the user select a

link back in Plant-Model list page 20 and the system will strip the link to the parent

Model page 24 as anchor (paragraph [0091]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Hill's teaching of Plant-Models list page 20 contains a

link back to parent Model page 24 to Schneider's system in order to organize web

pages of documents in hierarchy manner from a broad entity to a more specific entity so

that a user can easily view modify a portion of a document easily and identify

associations between documents within web pages.

9. Claims 69, 80 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Schneider (US 6895430) in view of Cupps and O'Donnell and further in view of

Shanny (US 20040158617).

As to claims 69, 80 and 91, Schneider teaches the claimed limitation "wherein

the providing the instructions for the two or more search results to the client device in

response to the query includes providing a search result page" as (figs. 1d, 5a-6b).

Schneider teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the instructions are at least

one of a hidden tag and an attribute on a tag in the search result page".

Shanny teaches hidden tag (paragraph [0041]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

invention was made to apply Shanny's teaching of hidden tag to Schneider's system in

order to allow transmission of all the input data as result data when instructions for

submit are made and further to detect page load abandons in real time.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Bailey et al (US 6785671 B1) discloses displaying search results (abstract).

Contact Information

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571) 272-4078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cam Y Truong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169